

FCC ET Docket 13-44

Comments Relating to **Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis**

Submitted by: **dB Technology**

dB Technology is an independent EMC/Radio Test Site located in the United Kingdom. The dB Technology test facilities are "listed" with the FCC but are not "accredited".

The IRFA is intended to assess the impact of the proposed rule changes on "Small Entities". The document recognises that the majority of firms affected by the proposed changes are "Small Entities".

In essence, this IRFA states that the benefits will be that:

- (i) TCBs will now be able to certify equipment that incorporates "new technology" or for which there are no clearly defined measurement procedures;
- (ii) requiring "accreditation" of test labs and additional measures relating to TCBs will ensure a "level playing field" and ensure all TCBs operate in accordance with the Commissions rules.

We would argue that there is already a "level playing field" in that all companies (large or small) can currently choose whether or not to use an "accredited" test site. Guidance and control for TCBs is a completely different issue to the "accreditation" of the test labs. The IRFA does not make a strong case for the benefits of requiring test labs to be "accredited".

The IRFA **does not consider at all the potential negative effects** of requiring test labs to be "accredited". There is no doubt a cost overhead associated with "accreditation" which has a much more significant impact on smaller test labs and manufacturers' own in-house test facilities. Introducing these rules may result in some small test labs no longer being able to offer services to local small entities. This could lead to reduction in the number of competing test labs and increased cost for manufacturers.

The IRFA **does not consider at all the potential positive effects** of relaxing the current procedures for certain categories of equipment. For example, there are now many products containing high frequency digital electronics for which only **verification** is currently required, whereas for other products (domestic PCs and PC peripherals) the more burdensome processes **Declaration of Conformity** or **Certification** are required. The FCC is not suggesting that there are any widespread problems caused by **verified** products so should the FCC not be examining the possibility of allowing a wider range of products to be approved using this route. This would have a dramatic positive impact on easing the burden of the approval process for many small entities.